UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/668,553	09/22/2000	Paul E. Jacobs	PA000370	2167

23696 7590 07/23/2004

Qualcomm Incorporated
Patents Department
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, CA 92121-1714

EXAMINER	
ALVAREZ, RAQUEL	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3622	

DATE MAILED: 07/23/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/668,553	JACOBS ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Raquel Alvarez	3622

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *17 June 2004*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-18 and 51-53* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-18 and 51-53* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *6/25/04*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to communication filled on 6/17/2004.

2. Original claims 1-18 and 51-53 remain the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

3. Claims 1-18 and 51-53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claims are recite functional descriptive material (software/program per se).

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington,* 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

4. Claims 1-18 and 51-53 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-40 of copending Application No.09/679,039. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the copending application further recites transmitting ad-statistical data. Calculating and transmitting

statistical data it is old and well known in business in order to calculate and transmit statistical data in order to make educated assumptions and statements on a particular subject. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to have included transmitting ad-statistical data in order to achieve the above mentioned advantage.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-18 and 51-53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marsh et al. (5,848,397 hereinafter Marsh) in view of Werkhoven (WO 99/59097 hereinafter Werkhoven).

With respect to claims 1-3, 6-8, 11-18, 51-53 Marsh teaches software for use on a client device that is configured for communications with at least one remote source of advertisements via a communications network (Abstract). An advertisement download function that downloads advertisements from at least one remote source, during one or more advertisements download sessions (see figure 4, item 601); an advertisement store function that stores the download advertisements on a storage medium associated with the client device (col. 14, lines 1-10); an advertisement display function that effects

display of at least selected ones of the stored advertisements on a display associated with the client device (Figure 6, 702).

With respect to an ad obscured ad monitor function that determines whether an obscured ad condition has occurred, whereby the obscured ad condition occurs when an advertisement current being displayed on the display associated with the client device is being obscured by one or more other items currently being displayed on the display and an obscured nag function that generates an obscured ad nag display in response to detection of the obscured ad condition, wherein the obscured nag display notifies the user of the obscured ad condition. Werkhoven teaches an Internet advertising system, the system monitors if a user opens a window in front of the popup window which has the advertisements, if the system detects that a popup window has been blocked for a predetermined time, then the user is notified of the time limit by returning the pop window to the frontmost position (see page 6, lines 2-5). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill inn the art at the time of Applicant's invention to have included the teachings of Werkhoven of ad obscured ad monitor function that determines whether an obscured ad condition has occurred, whereby the obscured ad condition occurs when an advertisement current being displayed on the display associated with the client device is being obscured by one or more other items currently being displayed on the display and an obscured nag function that generates an obscured ad nag display in response to detection of the obscured ad condition, wherein the obscured nag display notifies the user of the obscured ad condition because such a modification would allow to "**determine if the user had closed the**

window containing the advertisement before the advertisement could complete its presentation" (col. 1, lines 28-30).

With respect to claims 9-10, Marsh further teaches that the software is subsidized by revenues attributable to the downloaded advertisements (col. 3, lines 66-, col. 4, lines 1-6).

Claims 4-5 further recite giving the user a choice of removing whatever is obscuring the advertisement and switching the operating from a first operating mode to a second operating mode, wherein the second operating mode has less features than the first operating mode. The combination of Marsh and Werkhoven teach giving the user a choice of opening a pop window in front of the advertisement displayed and notifying the user that he or she is obscuring the advertisements by removing whatever is obscuring the advertisement (i.e. bringing the advertisement from the background to the foreground)(see rejection above of claims 1-3, 6-8, 11-18 and 51-53). With respect to operating from a first operating mode to a second operating mode, wherein the second operating mode has less features than the first operating mode. Official notice is taken that it is old and well known in the computer related arts to switch from one operating mode to another operating mode that has less features when a problem arises with one of the operating mode because such a modification would allow the software to operate with less features and in that case less problems are less likely to occur. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to have included as one of the choices switching the operating from a first operating mode to a second operating mode, wherein the second operating

mode has less features than the first operating mode in order to obtain the above mentioned advantage.

Response to Arguments

6. With respect to the double patenting concerning U.S. Application No. 09/679,039, the double patenting is sustained. Applicant is reserving response to the provisional rejection until all other issues of patentability are settled in both applications. Therefore the double patenting rejection is sustained.

7. Applicant argues that Marsh doesn't teach software for use on a client device that downloads advertisements on a client device.

8. Applicant argues that Marsh doesn't teach software for use on a client device with a function that downloads the advertisements. The Examiner disagrees with Applicant because Marsh clearly teaches that the advertisements are stored on the client's device and the message display scheduler 700 is part of the client device which has a mechanism or software to later displayed the advertisements at prescribed times (see Figure 6).

9. Applicant argues that Marsh doesn't teach notifying a user of an obscured ad. The Examiner disagrees with Applicant because in Werkhoven, if the ad is obscured for an exceeded amount of time then, the system returns the ad to the frontmost position in order to notify the user that the ad was obscured.

10. Applicant argues that Werkhoven doesn't teach an obscured ad nag display. The Examiner disagrees with Applicant because by returning the ad to the frontmost position in essence, the system is notifying the user that the ad was obscured.

11. Applicant argues that Marsh doesn't disclose an ad server. The Examiner disagree with Applicant because Marsh teaches on figure 8, advertiser server 108.

12. Applicant argues that Marsh doesn't teach an installer function for installing the software. The Examiner disagrees with Applicant because since, Marsh teaches software for use on the device then it has to include installing the software to make operable.

13. Applicant argues that Marsh doesn't teach that the software is subsidized by revenues attributable to the downloaded advertisements. The Examiner disagrees with Applicant because Marsh clearly teaches on col. 3, lines 2-4 "The invention is particularly well-suited to presenting advertisements to users of an electronic mail service, thereby eliminating the need to charge the users for the service".

14. With respect to arguments to claims 4-5, the Examiner asserts that the combination of Marsh and Werkhoven teach giving the user a choice of opening a pop window in front of the displayed advertisement and notifying the user that he or she is obscuring the advertisements by removing whatever is obscuring the advertisement (i.e. bringing the advertisement from the background to the foreground is a notification to the

user that the ads were obscured . The Applicant has agreed with Examiner that switching from one operating mode to another operating mode is well known when software problem occurs. Nevertheless, Applicant argues that in instant application, the switching from one operating mode to another operating mode is not directed to software problems. The Applicant is reminded that the fact that applicant has recognized another advantage which would flow naturally from following the suggestion of the prior art cannot be the basis for patentability when the differences would otherwise be obvious. See *Ex parte Obiaya*, 227 USPQ 58, 60 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1985).

15. The Examiner asserts that Marsh in combination with Werkhoven teach the claimed invention.

Conclusion

16. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Raquel Alvarez whose telephone number is (703)305-0456. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eric w Stamber can be reached on (703)305-8469. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Raquel Alvarez
Examiner
Art Unit 3622

R.A.
7/21/04